

and I certainly would oppose just taking agency by agency and working out programs because as you well know the political process will make all of those programs in the different agencies different. We've got a little bit different need here or there. I think one that amused me was the one in the Games and Parks Commission for the enforcement officers or wardens that needed this extra pay because of the dangerousness of their job but in visiting with the lobbyist that was talking to me about they need the extra money because the job was dangerous, we immediately agreed that the longer you're a warden, the better you are and the less dangerous the job is to that warden because pretty soon he's inside. Pretty soon he's an official but his longevity goes right on. This particular argument that would say we need longevity pay because it's a dangerous occupation works completely backwards to the way hazard duty pay would work, yet that's one of the tenacles to sell longevity is that it's a dangerous job and obviously is poorly thought out, poorly presented and obviously incorrect. I believe we certainly should have the Budget Committee look into this merit pay, look into longevity pay and other such propositions but I think we should not be doing it on the floor of this Legislature via amendment and I would not support any longevity pay at this time.

PRESIDENT: Senator Clark.

SENATOR CLARK: Mr. President, I'd like to ask Senator Warner a question. Senator Warner, they say there's only \$2,000 coming out of the general fund. What does this affect next year on the salary?

SENATOR WARNER: Well as I understand the amendment, Senator Clark, it's just to be a one time deal. I'm not sure if it is or if it isn't. I do have another amendment if we do not strike it to make sure that it is only a one time expenditure. At least that is the way it was done with the patrol last year. It was just one time so it would have the impact on the budget next year would be the same dollar amount at least times whatever increase of inflation we have so (interruption.)

SENATOR CLARK: Would you have a \$2,000 limitation next year or would you have--would you take the amount that's coming out of the Game and Parks fund this year added to the \$2,000 for next year as an ongoing pay?

SENATOR WARNER: It would obviously be an ongoing proposition in that dollar amount every year.

SENATOR CLARK: So you're not just talking about \$2,000, you're talking about \$30,000 or something like that?

SENATOR WARNER: It depends on how many years you want to multiply it by, yes.

SENATOR CLARK: Probably the thing that disturbs me the most is the fact you talk about these game wardens contacting people 60% of the time with guns and that kind of shook me up because I thought it was 100% of the time. Whenever they've contacted me, I've had a gun like everyone does when they're out in the field. I don't know how many game wardens have ever been killed in the line of duty. I think Miles Merriakilled one one time but that's about the only one that's ever been killed. There have been several patrolmen killed so I don't think you should